



Review of parking restrictions in areas outside the Guildford Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone and ad-hoc changes throughout the Borough

**Surrey County Council
Local Committee (Guildford)**

22 June 2011

KEY ISSUE

This report presents the full assessment of 31 ad-hoc requests for controls in various locations throughout the borough, following the Committee's previous agreement to progress those locations, out of the 117 locations considered in total, which scored highest as a result of the initial desktop assessment.

SUMMARY

As part of the cyclical review of parking issues, it is the turn of issues outside the Guildford town centre controlled parking zone to be considered. This report presents the findings of the full assessment of ad-hoc requests for controls, and recommends that the proposals developed for the 18 highest scoring locations are formally advertised. It also makes recommendations to formally advertise the introduction of new Disabled Persons Parking Spaces, and the formalisation of some existing advisory ones. Furthermore, the report also recommends the formal advertisement of changes to existing controls to accommodate recently created vehicle crossovers and building developments, and to make a small number of technical changes to the order so that it matches the restrictions in-situ.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee is asked to agree that:

- (i) the proposals developed for the 18 highest scoring locations identified in **ANNEXE 3**, and detailed in **ANNEXE 6**, are formally advertised,
- (ii) proposals to amend and introduce formalised disabled parking bays identified in **ANNEXE 4**, and detailed in **ANNEXE 6**, are formally advertised,
- (iii) proposals to amend the order to accommodate newly created vehicle crossovers and new developments, and a small number of technical amendments identified in **ANNEXE 5**, and detailed in **ANNEXE 6**, are formally advertised,
- (iv) that any unresolved objections that may arise in relation to the formal advertising of the proposals associated with recommendations (i), (ii) & (iii), are decided, in accordance with the County Council's constitution, by the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager in consultation with the relevant divisional member and the Local Committee Chairman and Vice Chairman.

1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 1.1 In December 2004 the Committee agreed a cycle of reviews alternating between the Guildford town centre controlled parking zone (CPZ) and the areas outside the CPZ. It was envisaged that each cycle would take 18 months with implementation of the changes from one review being implemented during the last six months and coinciding as the design phase for the next review (see **ANNEXE 1**).
- 1.2 The last review concerning issues outside the CPZ reviewed the situation in Ash, Ash Vale and Ripley. The last review dealing with issues within the CPZ was completed last year.
- 1.3 Prior to and since the Borough Council's Parking Services took over responsibility for formalised parking controls throughout the borough, numerous requests for parking controls have been received.
- 1.4 Although, in many cases, these have subsequently formed the basis of the geographic-based parking reviews, such as those previously undertaken in Ash, Ash Vale and Ripley, and those which are currently ongoing in Ashenden Estate, Park Barn, Westborough, Stoughton and Slyfield, there are many others issues which need to be considered.
- 1.5 At its meeting in September 2009, the Committee agreed an assessment methodology by which the various requests for other controls would be assessed (see **ANNEXE 2**).

- 1.6 In total, there have been requests for controls in 117 specific locations. At its meeting in September 2010, the Committee agreed that, following an initial desktop study, 30 of these locations should be assessed fully and proposals developed in a number of them (see **ANNEXE 3 and 6**).
- 1.7 Subsequently, accident data came to light in Chester Road, Ash, a location that initially did not qualify for a full assessment, which meant that this location scored over 15, and therefore merited full assessment. As a result, in total, 31 locations were assessed fully.
- 1.8 At its meeting in September 2009, the Committee also agreed that requests for disabled parking spaces and changes necessary to accommodate newly created vehicle crossovers and building developments would be included in the most convenient review, rather than waiting for a review dealing with that particular location. **ANNEXE 4, 5 and 6** of this report identify and detail the proposed measures.

2 ANALYSIS

- 2.1 Previously, the initial desktop study used key criteria from the full assessment methodology, and considered the road's classification, accident history, whether the location is on a bus route, close to a school, hospital or other public amenity, as well as its proximity to existing controls. The nature of the engagement with the public, residents/community groups, parish, borough and county members, the MPs and emergency services was also considered.
- 2.2 The highest scoring locations as a result of the preliminary assessment were Ash Street and Manor Road, Ash and Kings Road / Chinthurst Road, Shalford, all of which scored 37 out of 53. The average score for locations was just over 10. 61% of locations scored below 10. Of the 117 locations assessed, 31 scored 15 or more, and these have subsequently been subject to a full assessment.
- 2.3 The full assessment considers each location in terms of the criteria identified in **ANNEXE 2**. A summary of the scores resulting from the full assessment of the 31 locations can be seen in **ANNEXE 3**.
- 2.4 The full assessment has a maximum score of 100. The highest scoring location as a result of the full assessment is Kings Road / Chinthurst Road, Shalford, with a score of 55, with Ash Street and Manor Road, Ash both scoring 49. The average score of the locations assessed fully is 32. Of the 31 locations assessed fully, 18 of them score 30 or more. All 12 of the locations with accident histories are amongst the 18 locations which score 30 or more, including Chester Road, Ash.
- 2.5 Proposals have been developed for the 18 locations which score 30 or more and it is recommended that these proposals are formally advertised (see **ANNEXE 6**).

- 2.6 In some cases, in order to try to resolve issues in specific locations, and mitigate against potential displacement elsewhere, more extensive controls have been developed, in locations not previously highlighted as being problematic. The proposals in New Road, Chilworth, Ash Street and Foreman Road, Ash and Kingfisher Drive, Merrow are examples of this, where a series of measures are proposed around several junctions in the area, rather than just the one or two highlighted. Although this will result in the need for wider consultation, it is advisable to consider the need for wider controls, to try to pre-empt potential issues which might otherwise occur if more limited controls were introduced.
- 2.7 The remaining 13 locations, which did not score more than 30 when fully assessed, and indeed the numerous others which did not progress beyond the initial desktop assessment, will remain on the list and will continue to be reviewed to account for changes in the circumstances in any locations and will be reported to the Committee periodically.
- 2.8 Since the previous CPZ review was completed the County Council have considered a number of requests for Disabled Persons Parking Places introduced to meet the needs of specific residents. Some of these are located where there are already formalised controls, or have involved existing advisory facilities which, unfortunately, have been subject to regular misuse by non-blue badge holders. Similarly, Guildford Borough Council's Parking Services has received requests for improved facilities for blue badge holders in East Horsley and Ripley village centres. Therefore, controls are proposed in the locations highlighted in **ANNEXE 4**. Please note, however, that two of the locations identified (Bury Fields and Kingpost Parade, Guildford) are situated in locations where the County Council will soon be considering pay and display parking. Therefore, it would be more appropriate for these two to be considered as part of those proposals.
- 2.9 Since the previous CPZ review was completed a number of vehicle crossovers have been introduced where they come into conflict with formalised parking bays. Similarly, a number of developments have been built with vehicular accesses which conflict with the existing parking controls. Therefore, controls are proposed in the locations highlighted in **ANNEXE 5**.
- 2.10 In the intervening period a number of anomalies have been identified between the controls which appear in-situ and those which appear within the traffic regulation order supporting the parking controls. These involve Clandon Road, West Clandon, Station Road, Shalford, and Epsom Road, West Horsley. Therefore, changes to the order are proposed in the locations highlighted in **ANNEXE 5**, although because of their nature, this will not actually result in any actual physical changes on the ground.
- 2.11 It is important that new schemes can be enforced. The proposals for Ashenden, Park Barn, Stoughton, Westborough and the Slyfield

Industrial Estate reported elsewhere on the agenda and the ad-hoc schemes will increase the amount of restrictions that need to be enforced. If these schemes are implemented it is likely that the amount of formal restrictions will have increased by around 10% since decriminalised parking enforcement was introduced in 2004. The County Council are currently reviewing the way in which parking enforcement is delivered in the future and this will provide an opportunity to review resources and the way they are used.

3 OPTIONS

- 3.1 A major part of the present parking review has been the consideration long-standing issues in a small number geographic locations (Ashenden, Park Barn, Stoughton, Westborough and the Slyfield Industrial Estate) which were reported to the Committee's March meeting. Nevertheless, there has also been a desire to deal with a small number of pressing issues elsewhere throughout the borough. The latter have formed the ad-hoc review. As a result, it is envisaged that it will only be possible to introduce measure in the highest scoring 18 locations, out of 117 in total where concerns have been raised.
- 3.2 Of course, even at this late stage during the review cycle, if members were so inclined, they could choose to develop and advertise proposals in a greater number of the 31 locations assessed fully. However, this would impact on the implementation of controls in the small number geographic locations being undertaken as part of the present review, and delay the next review of the Controlled Parking Zone.

4 CONSULTATIONS

- 4.1 Of the 18 locations for which proposals have been developed, many involve the introduction of one-off measures, rather than a whole raft of controls. Therefore, the need for more involved consultation, such as that associated with the geographic-based element of the review, is not considered appropriate. Nevertheless, in a number of the locations, such as those identified in para.2.6, a series of controls are being considered over a wider area, and therefore more extensive consultation is justified. Although an informal consultation stage is not considered necessary in such circumstances, a mail shot notifying nearby properties of the proposals and the formal advertising period would be appropriate in a number of cases.

5 FINANCIAL AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The cost consolidating the Town Non-Guildford Town Centre Controlled Parking Zone and Parished Areas orders is estimated to be in the region of £6,000.
- 5.2 The cost of undertaking the initial consultation in Ashenden Estate, Park Barn, Westborough, Stoughton and Slyfield, the initial and subsequent

assessments of the ad-hoc requests, and the cost of formally advertising and implementing any subsequently developed controls is obviously dependent on the scale of the measures involved. Nevertheless, it is not envisaged that this will cost more than £50,000 (combined cost for all the geographic areas and the ad-hoc changes).

5.3 All the above costs can be funded from the CPZ on-street account.

6 EQUALITIES AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Reviewing the need for the introduction of formalised disabled bays on an annual basis, and regardless of locality, will improve accessibility for blue badge holders. Otherwise, there are no equality or diversity implications.

7 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There are no crime and disorder implications.

8 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 That the locations identified in **ANNEX 3, 4 and 5**, and proposals detailed in **ANNEXE 6** are formally advertised.

9 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 The proposed controls will ensure easier traffic flow, particularly around junctions and promote a better balance in the use of kerbside space.

10 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

10.1 That the locations identified in **ANNEXES 3, 4 and 5** and proposals detailed in **ANNEXE 6** are formally advertised and any unresolved objections that may arise in relation to these are decided, in accordance with the County Council's constitution, by the Parking Strategy and Implementation Team Manager in consultation with the relevant divisional member and the Local Committee Chairman and Vice Chairman.

LEAD OFFICER: Kevin McKee, Parking Services Manager
TELEPHONE NUMBER: 01483 444530

E-MAIL: Kevin.mckee@guildford.gov.uk

CONTACT OFFICER: Andrew Harkin, On Street Parking Co-ordinator
TELEPHONE NUMBER: 01483 444535

E-MAIL: Andrew.harkin@guildford.gov.uk